

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed on December 15, 2004. The Office Action has rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Liu et al. (US Patent Application 2004/0032019).

Claims 1-13 remain pending. In this response, no amendment has been made to the claims or the specification.

Applicant has most respectfully considered the remarks set forth in this Office Action. Regarding the obvious rejections, it is however strongly believed that the cited references are deficient to adequately teach the claimed features as recited in the presently pending claims.

Response to 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Liu et al. (US 2004.0032019, Liu hereinafter).

Applicants respectfully submit that APAF in view of Liu is legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claims 1-13 unpatentable because the references, taken alone or combined, fail teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claims.

Claim 1 reads as:

A chip package structure, at least comprising:

a carrier having a surface, a power pad and a ground pad, said surface having a die bonding area, said power pad and said ground pad being on said surface, said power pad and said ground pad being disposed outside said die bonding area;

a die having an active surface and a backside corresponding to said active surface, said backside being attached to said die bonding area on said surface of said carrier, said die having a plurality of die pads on said active surface;

at least a passive component disposed between said power pad and said ground pad, said passive component having at least *two electrodes electrically and physically connected to said power pad and said ground pad* respectively; and

at least *a first conducting wire having two ends electrically and physically connected to one of said plurality of die pads and one of said electrodes* respectively.

The cited prior art does not teach or suggest the above emphasized features of the present invention. As acknowledged in the Office Action, AAPA does not disclose a first conductive wire having two ends connected to one of the die pads and one of the electrodes. The Office cited Liu to supply the missing elements and stated that "Liu discloses in figure 4 wires 160 and 170 connecting the die 110 to the power pad 120".

However, as clearly shown in Fig. 4 of Liu, only two contacts (electrodes) 120a and 120b are electrically and physically connected to ground pad 104 and power pad 106, respectively. But, no conductive wire is electrically and physically connected to any one of contacts 120a and 120b. Wire 160 is electrically and physically connected to a bonding region of a bonding section 150. Bonding section 150 comprises a dielectric material formed on the surface of decoupling capacitor 120 and a gold or palladium bonding region formed on the dielectric material (paragraph [0028], page 2), which clearly is not electrically and physically connected to the power pad 106 or the ground pad 104.

Furthermore, Liu never teaches or suggests that ground pad 104 is electrically connected to a conductive wire through an electrode. In fact, as shown in Fig. 2, ground pad 104 is electrically connected to a die pad by wire 130.

Therefore, even if AAPA is combined with Liu, the combination still fails to teach the above emphasized features of claim 1, i.e., one end of wire is electrically and physically connected to a die pad, the other end of the wire is electrically and physically connected to an electrode which is electrically and physically connected to a power pad or ground pad.

It has been well established that in order to render a claim obvious the combined references must teach each and every elements recited in that claim, the combination of AAPA and Liu clearly fails to teach each and every elements recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over AAPA and Liu. For similar reasons, claim 9 is also patentable over AAPA and Liu. Claims 2-8 and 10-13 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, and thus are also patentable for at least the same reasons.


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the presently pending claims 1-13 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: 2 / 7 / 2005

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS


Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330